







UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/765,960	01/19/2001	Mitsukazu Momosaki	ALPHA 3.0-001	9159	
7	590 04/01/2003				
WEINGRAM & ASSOCIATES, P.C.			EXAMINER		
	Valley Avenue		PRONE, J.	PRONE, JASON D	
Maywood, NJ	ywood, NJ 07607 ART UNIT PAPER		PAPER NUMBER		
			3724	40	
			DATE MAILED: 04/01/2003	<u>(</u> 9	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			NIX			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	[11]			
Advisory Action	09/765,960	MOMOSAKI, MITSU	IKAZU			
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jason Prone	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 11 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avecinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated a timely filed amendment whicled amendment whicles	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in			
<del></del>	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
<ul> <li>a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).</li> <li>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The</li> </ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the appr	on. See MPEP opriate extension			
ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Ciannels	the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	originally set in the final	Office action; or			
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF</li> </ol>						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		•			
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
<ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceling</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>	ng a corresponding number of f	inall <u>y</u> rejected claim	S.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b ould be rejected is provided belo	)∏ will be entered a w or appended.	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ally					
Claim(s) allowed:	Allan N. Shoap					
Claim(s) objected to:	Supervisory Patent Examine	r				
Claim(s) rejected:	Group 3700					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	•		iner.			
9. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449)	·				
10. Other:			2			



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the Burnaham patent anticipates claims 6-9, 11, 12, 15, and 17 as they are claimed. The arguments that Burnham does not have two identical blades and that these two identical blades both curve in two different dimensions is noted. The Examiner agrees with these two arguments, however, the structural limitations of these arguments are not found in claims 6-17. It is also noted that the Burnham patent does disclose that a single blade that curves in two dimensions. The first curve is shown in Figure 3 along the line from number 14 to 14, while the second curve is also shown in Figure 3 represented as item 15. In response to applicant's argument that Burnham is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Burnham's apparatus is for crushing a brittle material which is claimed on the last line of applicant's claim 6. Finally, The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "space between one of the two opposing outer portions of said first and said second blade edges is less than the space between the other of said opposing outer portions..." must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.